

tion should notify the Docket Clerk, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, before September 20. Participants should refer to the original notice (38 FR 12619) for a brief statement of the procedures to be followed at the hearing.

(Sec. 202, 84 Stat. 971, 45 U.S.C. 431; § 1.49 (n), 49 CFR 1.49 (n))

Issued in Washington, D.C. on August 7, 1973.

DONALD W. BENNETT,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 73-16857 Filed 8-14-73; 8:45 am]

Office of Pipeline Safety
[49 CFR Part 192]

[Notice No. 73-2; Docket No. OPS-24]

GAS IN TRANSMISSION LINES
Odorization Requirements

The Office of Pipeline Safety is considering amending Part 192 of Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to require odorization of gas in certain transmission lines, and to prescribe special patrolling and leakage survey requirements for transmission lines on the basis of their class location and whether or not they are carrying odorized gas.

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed amendment by submitting written information, views, or arguments. Communications should be identified by the notice number and docket number and submitted in duplicate to the Office of Pipeline Safety, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590. Comments received by Sept. 28, 1973, will be considered before final action is taken on the proposal. All comments received will be available for examination by interested persons in the Rules Docket at the Office of Pipeline Safety.

The present requirement for odorization of gas in transmission lines represents an interim measure that was adopted to permit the continued application of State law pending outcome of a study by the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS). That study has now been completed. Its conclusions, reflected in this notice, are based on comments made in response to previous notices (70-5, 35 FR 5482; 70-11, 35 FR 9293; 70-13, 35 FR 13470), an informal public hearing held on September 17, 1970, and on information which has been furnished by recent contacts with transmission operators, distribution operators, and State commissions experienced in the transportation of odorized gas in transmission lines.

In the transmission lines of those operators who odorize gas, a number of leaks have been located through odorization. The fact of such results refutes any contentions that odorization is appropriate only for distribution mains and service lines and that high pressure leaks are detectable only by other means. Odorization allows the early detection of leaks and does not limit detection to company employees. In a number of cases, odoriza-

tion led to discovery of leaks that would not have been disclosed until later by the means normally used.

Some transmission operators unfamiliar with odorization are concerned over possible difficulties in handling odorized gas as it goes through compressor stations and through high pressure metering and regulating stations. They also fear an adverse effect on the operation of dehydration units and the possibility of false gas leak scares at the time of blow down for maintenance. However, operators with long experience in odorizing all their transmission facilities, including compressors, regulators, and measuring stations, have reported no significant problems once a system is stabilized. Normally, odorizers are placed downstream of dehydration units so that the units are not subject to adverse effects. Moreover, even though blow down may be required for maintenance, adequate planning with advance notice to the public should minimize problems caused by odorant dropping out of the gas.

With regard to stability of odorizing systems, during the early stages of an odorization program there may be considerable fade of odorant level, particularly in extensive piping systems. However, over a long period of operation, the system tends to stabilize. Moreover, experience has shown that once a reasonable degree of stability has been reached in a transmission line, the distribution companies supplied gas from that line have little problem maintaining a stable concentration.

The OPS recognizes that odorization of gas destined for use in some industrial processes would serve no purpose and could even be detrimental. Thus, where odorants would be detrimental to the industrial process itself, or where strong plant odors characteristic of the customer's process would mask the natural gas odorants, odorization should not be required. Accordingly, it is proposed to except the gas in transmission lines intended for use in such industrial processes from the odorization requirement.

Comments in response to previous notices observed that considerable expense would be incurred by operators and consumers in providing deodorizing equipment to prepare the gas from odorized transmission lines for industrial and other uses where odorization is detrimental. As proposed in this notice, however, the exceptions to the odorization requirement in such cases would make deodorization equipment unnecessary and equipment costs for deodorization are therefore not a consideration.

There should be little or no problem of odorization poisoning of the hydrostatic test water that is removed by pigging operations after requalification or up-rating tests, or of poisoning the liquids that are required to be initially removed from the gas. Most liquids are removed at the dehydration plants near the point of production prior to odorization. Odorization of transmission lines is required only where the lines go into populated

areas, and most liquids are removed by that time.

A situation may exist in which a distributor is supplied from two or more transmission systems that use different odorants. Such distributors have reported no problems of compatibility and no potentially hazardous conditions. One distributor that is supplied gas odorized with mercaptan has supplemented this with cyclic-sulfide without problems.

The effectiveness of transmission line odorization has been questioned in the case of a small leak in a buried high pressure transmission pipeline, because of the odor adsorption properties of soil and the refrigeration effect of expanding high pressure gas. However, although there may be some initial reduction of the detectable qualities of the odorant due to these causes, such effects last for a limited time only. While the type of soil influences the adsorption rate, moisture in the soil and in the gas and a high gas velocity reduce the adsorption rate. Moreover, the refrigeration effect, which forms a shield of ice crystals, thus reducing the area of soil adsorbent surface, combined with the high vaporization pressure of mercaptans at low temperature and the high solubility of mercaptans in natural gas, tends to carry the odorant from high pressure gas at low temperature through to the surface better than at lower pressure with little temperature drop. Field tests using mercaptan type odorants have shown them to be effective and detectable in the atmosphere around underground leaks from high pressure gas lines.

There now exist high pressure gas transmission pipelines in Class 4 locations that run parallel to other utility lines underneath the solid paving of city streets. To permit these transmission lines to be operated without odorization while gas distribution lines in the same street operating at much lower pressure and stress levels are required to be odorized is illogical. While for these and other built-up areas, flame ionization surveys appear to be an effective means of locating small leaks, such surveys are required only on a periodic basis. However, people who have a normal sense of smell are in the area everyday and are capable of detecting any escaping odorized gas.

Under this proposal, a general requirement for odorization of gas in transmission lines in Class 3 and Class 4 locations would be established. Exceptions would be provided, however, for gas in transmission lines enroute to underground storage fields, and in Class 3 locations enroute to predominantly Class 1 or Class 2 locations. Since the transmission lines in such locations are relatively few and are not those normally supplying distribution systems, safety considerations do not indicate that the cost of odorization is justified. As noted above, there is also an exception for gas intended for use in an industrial process where the presence of odorant would be detrimental.

Under the proposal, additional requirements for patrolling would be set forth in § 192.705 and new requirements for conducting leakage surveys would be estab-

lished in a new § 192.706. Such requirements are consistent with the odorization requirements proposed in § 192.625 and give effect to the need for increased surveillance of transmission lines in which the gas is not odorized and of transmission lines in the higher class locations.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend Part 192 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations as set forth below.

1. It is proposed to amend § 192.625 by amending paragraph (g) and adding a new paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 192.625 Odorization of gas.

(g) Except as provided in paragraph (h) of this section, combustible gases in transmission lines in Class 3 and Class 4 locations must be odorized as provided in paragraphs (b) through (f) of this section.

(h) Notwithstanding paragraph (g) of this section, odorization of combustible gas in a transmission line is not required—

(1) When the gas is enroute to an underground storage field;

(2) In a Class 3 location through which the line is passing enroute to a predominantly Class 1 or Class 2 location; or

(3) In a Class 3 location when any part of the gas is intended for use in an industrial process in which the presence of odorant would be detrimental.

2. It is proposed to amend § 192.705 to read as follows:

§ 192.705 Transmission lines: patroling.

(a) Each operator shall have a patrol program to observe surface conditions on and adjacent to the transmission line right-of-way for indications of leaks, construction activity, and other factors affecting safety and operation.

(b) The frequency of the patrol must be determined by the size of the line, the operating pressures, the class location, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors, but in no case at intervals exceeding 1 year.

(c) In addition to the frequency requirements of paragraph (b) of this section, each transmission line must be patrolled—

(1) At intervals not exceeding 6 months in a Class 3 location when carrying unodorized gas;

(2) At intervals not exceeding 3 months in a Class 4 location whether carrying odorized or unodorized gas; and

(3) At highway and railroad crossings more often and in greater detail than adjoining areas of the transmission line.

3. It is proposed to add a new § 192.706 to read as follows:

§ 192.706 Transmission lines: leakage surveys.

(a) Each operator of a transmission line shall provide for periodic leakage surveys in its operating and maintenance plan.

(b) Leakage surveys of a transmission line must be conducted at intervals

not exceeding 1 year except that gas detector surveys must be conducted—

(1) At intervals not exceeding 6 months in a Class 3 location when carrying unodorized gas; and

(2) At intervals not exceeding 3 months in a Class 4 location whether carrying odorized or unodorized gas.

This notice is issued under the authority of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (49 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), § 1.58(d) of the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR 1.58(d)), and the redelegation of authority to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, set forth in Appendix A of Part 1 of the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR Part 1).

Issued in Washington, D.C. on Aug. 9, 1973.

JOSEPH C. CALDWELL,
Director,
Office of Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc.73-16856 Filed 8-14-73;8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[40 CFR Part 52]

APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS; OHIO

Opportunity for Public Comment on Proposed Transportation and/or Land Use Control Strategies

On June 15, 1973, pursuant to section 110(a) of the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR Part 51, the Administrator announced his disapproval of the control strategy for photochemical oxidants in the Cincinnati, Toledo, and Dayton regions of Ohio due to the lack of timely submittal of transportation control plans. This was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 22, 1973 (38 FR 16550).

The Administrator has proposed a transportation control plan for Cincinnati (38 FR 17702, July 2, 1973). The Administrator has not proposed plans for Toledo and Dayton because of preliminary indications that no transportation controls are necessary in those regions.

If, prior to promulgation, a State has adopted and submitted a plan or revision which the Administrator determines to be in accordance with applicable requirements, the State plan will be approved in lieu of promulgation. This notice is issued to advise the public that supplemental information has been received from the State of Ohio regarding these three regions, and that comments may be submitted on whether the control strategy for photochemical oxidants in the regions should be approved or disapproved by the Administrator under section 110(a) of the Clean Air Act. Only comments received within 21 days from the publication of this notice will be considered. Notice of opportunity to comment on State plans has been published previously on April 24, April 27, May 4, June 1, June 22, and July 18, 1973.

A more detailed description of the information submitted is set forth below.

OHIO

A document entitled "Implementation Plan to Achieve Ambient Air Quality Standards for Photochemical Oxidants—Cincinnati Air Quality Control Region," dated March 1973, was received on July 16, 1973, along with a submittal letter from the Governor dated June 29, 1973. A public hearing on the plan was held by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency on May 29, 1973. The plan states that a 44 percent reduction in hydrocarbon emissions is necessary in order to attain the oxidant standard, and that the standard will be met by July 1975 without any control measures other than the stationary source controls in the original plan. In order to attain this result, the plan states that mobile source emissions will decline sufficiently due to a combination of the Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program for new cars, as well as expected improved bus service and traffic flow improvements resulting from completion of the interstate highway and bridge system.

A document entitled "Implementation Plan to Achieve Ambient Air Quality Standards for Photochemical Oxidants—Toledo Air Quality Control Region," dated March 1973, was received on July 16, 1973, along with a submittal letter from the Governor dated June 29, 1973. A public hearing was held by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency on May 30, 1973. The plan states that a 50 percent reduction in hydrocarbon emissions is necessary in order to attain the oxidant standard, and that the standard will be met by 1975 without any control measures other than the stationary source controls in the original plan. In order to attain this result, the plan states that mobile source emissions will decline sufficiently due to the Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program for new cars. For informational purposes, the plan includes a discussion of programs underway to improve traffic flow in Toledo.

A document entitled "Implementation Plan to Achieve Ambient Air Quality Standards for Photochemical Oxidants—Dayton Air Quality Control Region," dated July 1973, was received on August 3, 1973, along with a submittal letter from the Governor dated July 24, 1973. A public hearing was held on May 17, 1973, by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. The plan states that the prescribed standard can be achieved in the Dayton Region without any control measures other than the stationary source controls in the original plan. This conclusion is based on data for calendar year 1972, which include maximum oxidant readings substantially below the maximum measured in 1971. The State proposes to submit a revised control strategy on or about November 15, 1973, if air quality data from 1973 show the need for one. The document submitted contains a preliminary strategy which might be used, including an inspection program for light-duty vehicles, improvements in mass transit, and an epi-